

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
96-98

September 30, 2002

RECEIVED

OCT 23 2002

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

Protect the Telecom Act of 1996! Provisions of the Telecom Act of 1996 require that the various Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs), such as Southwestern Bell, to unbundle their networks as a prerequisite to being allowed in the "InterLATA toll markets" (long distance). What this means is that in order for companies like Southwestern Bell to play in the long distance market, they are obligated to open their networks so that other companies can play in the local service market, a market they have had as a monopoly for many, many years.

Interestingly, Southwestern Bell's latest request to keep their networks bundled, is coming at a time when they have been allowed to start marketing long distance services to consumers in several states. In essence, Southwestern Bell wants to enjoy the benefit of selling long distance without living up to their obligation, as provided for by the Telecom Act of 1996, to unbundle their networks. Please keep in mind that the Telecom Act was created to ensure healthy competition in the marketplace, break down monopolies, and provide customers with a greater ability to choose among providers. We must have fairness in the marketplace. Since deregulation of the long distance market in 1984, long distance rates have fallen from over 50 cents a minute down to around 5 cents a minute, greatly benefiting the consumer. Competition in the local market is being threatened by Southwestern Bell's request to change the Telecom Act of 1996, for its own benefit.

Please vote for us, the consumers, and honor the already existing Telecom Act Of 1996, and say "no" to Southwestern Bell's pressure to change the Telecom Act.

Thankyou for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Maria and David Keathly
3090 Kelley Ave.
Ponca City, OK 74604

0
10/1/02
09/24/02

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-98

From: "Deanne Miller" <info@ntd.net>
To: <mpowell@fcc.gov>
Date: 8/5/02 4:01 PM
Subject: UNE-Platform

August 5, 2002

RECEIVED
OCT 23 2002
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Dear Michael Powell.

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, Northern Telephone & Data, offers local telephone service in the state of Wisconsin. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" - the UNE-Platform - to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

William Miller
President
Northern Telephone & Data

0 + 1

96-98

From: "Deanne Miller" <info@ntd.net>
To: <mpowell@fcc.gov>
Date: 8/5/02 4:01 PM
Subject: UNE-Platform

August 5 2002

Dear Michael Powell

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform"

My company, Northern Telephone & Data, offers local telephone service in the state of Wisconsin. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the Combination of "unbundled network elements" - the UNE-Platform - to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

William Miller
President
Northern Telephone & Data

RECEIVED
OCT 23 2002
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Office of Secretary

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

OCT 23 2002

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Secretary

96-98

Oct 4, 02
Michael Powell
Chairman FCC
445 12th St, S.W
Wash., D.C 20554
Fax # 1-202-418-0232

This is sent in response to your up coming hearings on the communications industry, according to Reuters report.

Dear Chairman Powell

Your hearings for the health of the communications industry, could be construed as featherbedding for the CEO'S, if not careful. First of all, our country was founded on competition. Competition forges for a better, lower cost product. Take AT&T for example. In the 80's they had the consumer by the tail and in the corner, which is where the locals have the consumer now. The present lack of confidence in Corporate America, is from the crooked CEO'S and other top officers. They are the ones that brought the country to its knees. If you wish to be constructive, then punish *the* crooks, not the consumer. Dealing out the earned punishment to those guilty will restore the people's trust, and the economy will turn around. Don't further perpetrate the guilty's crimes by punishing the consumer by denying equal access to all into the local markets. Just take a look at the fines already handed out to some of the locals for delaying the customer to get hooked up. Must be they are run by Clinton family members, for we know they don't have to obey any laws. The agreement was to let long distance carriers into the local market, as the locals are already into the long distance market. This is more like the Bully crying about the little kid picking on him. Make the right decision so that it doesn't come back to haunt you, and President Bush. Give the consumer a break and allow the competition to continue. Two consumers that are tired of getting raked over the coals.

Sincerely yours,
Everett and Joyce Hollister
8152 Wilson Karr Road
Hornell, N.Y. 14843

Distribution
OCT 08 2002
Confidential

10/4/02

October 7, 2002

Chairman Michael K. Powell
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20553

RECEIVED
OCT 23 2002
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

96-88

Sub. Correct irrational UNE-P (Unbundled Network Elements Platform) regulation, and Deregulate Regional Bell Operating Companies (RBLOCs) by allowing them to enter in to Long Distance Market and remove unfair restrictions on DSL build out.

Respected Chairman,

As concerned **US** citizens, California Residents. Telephone Consumers and also having a family member working for a telecom company..we would like to express our opinion about the current telecom regulatory environment in our country.

The UNE-P (Unbundled Network Elements) regulation under which RBLOCs are forced to lease their network to competitors (CLECs) at a highly discounted prices **is** bad for the country's economy, jobs and **also** to the consumers in the long run. This rule takes money RBLOCs and give it to the companies that have no local network of their own and make no investment in telecommunications equipment or facilities that can be used to provide local service. The wholesale prices set by the state regulators are below the cost and allowing competitors to purchase network access at deep discounts and pocket *the* difference. Here is why UNE-P is bad for the country's economy and, its consumers and workforce.

- These competitors don't invest in telecommunication equipment and facilities. They simply piggyback on RBLOCs. RBLOCs may not have any incentive to invest in the network modernization. This means, no improvement in the network.
- If neither RBLOCs nor CLECs invest in the telecom equipment then the telecom equipment makers such as Cisco, Nortel, Lucent, etc. will suffer. There is already a big slum and down turn in the telecom equipment industry. Many jobs are already lost and many more will disappear soon. It will simply kill the innovation and slowdown the growth **in** the telecom industry by several years.
- RBLOCs are announcing thousands layoffs in addition to the thousands laid off so far this year because UNE-P, other regulations and soft economy are hurting their bottom line RBLOCs employ more people just because they are the ones that maintain the network. This will make the country's unemployment **get** completely worse.

0

- Consumers are not benefited by UNE-P is either. The discounted price savings **are** not going to the consumers. They are going to the middleman (CLECs). **In** the long run, prices will go **up** as we have seen in the power industry in California.
- MCI Worldcom has gone bankrupt because of its deeds. ~~Many~~ CLECs have gone bankrupt because of bad and unrealistic business models. Only the Baby Bells are left relatively healthy in the telecom service industry because of their proven business models and conservative accounting. If **we** kill them too, then there is nothing left in the telecom service industry. Foreign companies will come and buy **all** our country's vital telecom assets at a dead cheap price. When that happens, it **will** sure become a national security issue.

In the current economy, after seeing all the accounting scandals and bankruptcies, we strongly feel reliability is as important as competition, It is totally unfair to tie up RBLOCs with many regulations and **expect** them to lower the prices to the consumers, be efficient and also reliable.

We request you to remove UNE-P regulation, which is bad for the country's economy, our jobs and eventually to the consumers. We also request you to provide RBLOCs **with** long distance relief and remove unfair regulations requiring the RBLOCs to share DSL infrastructure.

If you have any questions about *our* comments please feel free to call us.
Thanks.

Sincerely.



Mr. Venkat Madala
1201 Andreas Way
San Ramon, CA 94583
Phone: (925) 556-5562



Mrs. Rohini Madala
1201 Andreas Way
San Ramon, CA 94583
Phone: (925) 556-5562

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-98



RECEIVED

OCT 23 2002

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

October 9, 2002

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I ask your support for the continued availability of the "UNE-Platform."

My company, Access One, offers local telephone service in Illinois, California and Ohio. The company has achieved increasing success largely because it utilizes the combination of "unbundled network elements" – the UNE-Platform - to serve customers. It is absolutely critical that we have continued access to the UNE-Platform to remain competitive.

Unfortunately, the Regional Bell Operating Companies have launched a full-scale attack on the UNE-Platform, realizing it is a major threat to their continued market dominance. Their strategy is to impose certain restrictions on individual network elements that would destroy the competitive value of the UNE-Platform. If the RBOCs succeed, it will all but end any chance for consumers to enjoy the benefits of meaningful competition in local phone service.

Please oppose any effort at the Federal Communications Commission or at state agencies to limit the availability of the UNE-Platform. The UNE-Platform should be firmly and permanently established as a viable service option for competitive telecom carriers.

Thank you very much for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Brian Barkley
President
Access One Incorporated
Chicago, Illinois 60607
312 441-1000

041

Sharon Jenkins - UNE-P

XOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-98

From: "DANIEL, ANGELA C (SWBT)" <am6589@sbcc.com>
 To: "mpowell@fcc.gov" <mpowell@fcc.gov>, "kabernat@fcc.gov" <kabernat@fcc.gov>,
 "mcopps@fcc.gov" <mcopps@fcc.gov>, "kjmweb@fcc.gov" <kjmweb@fcc.gov>
 Date: 9/30/2002 3:00 PM
 Subject: UNE-P

As a second generation employee of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company and a citizen of the United States of America. I just wanted my voice to be heard regarding the unreasonable une-p regulations. I may very well be laid off within the next two weeks (my husband as well), because my employer cannot afford to pay me and subsidize the rest of the telecommunications industry. I am really not sure how it benefits the consumer to be given the option to have their service a dollar or two lower per month from a competitor, when our rates must continue to go up to allow for this. I really wonder what will happen to the telecommunications infrastructure of the nation, once we have laid off all our technicians (we laid off 2,000 last week). Your clerks do not bother to employ technicians. Southwestern Bell has always been in it for the long haul. We have always maintained the network. Do you really think that these newer companies are going to be capable of doing this? Even if they are financially capable, these are companies who are trying to make the highest possible profit margin. Why would they make that kind of investment when they can just back out? Since the FCC seems intent on running healthy and responsible telecommunications companies into the ground, I sincerely hope that you do have a contingency plan to allow telecommunications to continue once all the local service providers have filed for bankruptcy as you seem determined to force them to do.

Angela Daniel
 Residential Service Representative
 Southwestern Bell Telephone
 509 S Detroit Rm 1209
 Tulsa, OK 74120

RECEIVED
 OCT 23 2002
 Federal Communications Commission
 Office of Secretary

10/1/02
 071

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-98

RECEIVED

OCT 23 2002

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

October 4, 2002

The Honorable Pat Tiberi
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC20515

Dear Representative Tiberi,

The Telecommunications industry has a large impact on the national economy. It is an industry that has large capital spending, and its employees earn high wages and benefits

I am increasingly concerned about the imminent impact on thousands of employees of irrationally low UNE-P rates. Revenue continues to decline from the slowing economy. Unbalanced regulations regarding UNE-P wholesale pricing is placing an unfair burden on SBC. No company can stay in business selling things for half of what it costs them. Eventually, the company can no longer invest money for improvements. We ask that competitors invest in the networks that serve our communities. SBC recently announced headcount reductions of 11,000 people. I am asking you to please look at the facts and make fair changes to SBC's wholesale pricing. Keep Americans working. Artificially low wholesale prices left unchecked will eventually hurt customers. If SBC is unable to invest to maintain the network, everyone served by that network will suffer. I am not opposed to competition in the telecommunications industry, however the laws are not fair to the Regional Bell operating companies.

In an effort to promote competition in the discount retail store industry, would the government pass laws, and impose regulations that would require Wal-mart to rent portions of its floor space to competitors at a price that is below its cost, and then require Walmart to service the customers of its competitors? The companies that compete against SBC have salespeople, **but** they do not have employees that maintain the telephone network. Change needs to occur in the Telecommunications industry, that change is "DEREGULATION" change needs to occur now. High wage jobs and the nation's economy are at stake.

Sincerely

Connie Horne
6973 Candlish Drive
Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068CC: Michael Powell, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission

071

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-98

From: <Johnp65@aol.com>
To: <mpowell@fcc.gov>, <senator@rockefeller.senate.gov>, <senator_byrd@byrd.senate.gov>, <nrahall@mail.house.gov>, <senator_dewine@dewine.senate.gov>, <bobney@mail.house.gov>, <webmaster@puc.state.oh.us>, <Governor.Taft@das.state.oh.us>
Date: 9/27/02 9:25PM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Sir.

My name is John R. Porter and I am an employee of SBC. I write to you today to address my concerns with the current regulations towards the wholesale-reselling market, UNE-P. As of today, my company announced that 11,000 additional jobs were to be eliminated. I personally am on the borderline of this layoff and this has me greatly concerned. As a consumer, I am pro-competition in all markets, but it has to be fair competition. These resellers are 'renting' our lines at a reduced rate that is causing our company not only to lose revenue, but to actually take a loss to each line it loses. I know that the consumer was originally being thought of when these regulations were being written, but it seems that the consumer will ultimately 'pay' for these regulations in the fact that there is no new infrastructure being built and new broadband technology is sitting off to the side due to this. I have read on the FCC website that these issues are to be addressed Oct 7, 2002. I am pleased that you have recognized a need for reevaluation. Please act on this matter swiftly due to the constant decline in the telecommunications industry.

Thank you for your time,
John R. Porter
RD#2 Box 361
Moundsville, WV 26041
304-845-6861
johnp65@aol.com

RECEIVED
OCT 23 2002
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: <Hhhdah@aol.com>
To: <mpowell@fcc.gov>
Date: Wed, Oct 9, 2002 6:13 PM
Subject: SBC

RECEIVED 96-98

OCT 23 2002

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Why don't you take into consideration that SBC and all the RBOCS are struggling in the Competition? The operating companies have to pay for all the lines Installed, maintenance, and repair in storms etc The Competitors use our lines and don't even pay for the cost that we sell to our customers and then they undercut us and take away our customers. What is wrong with you people? Please help the RBOCS instead of hurting them so that they can compete. I am a retired communication technician from SBC and have seen my 401K go from \$250,000 to approximately \$84,000 since the 1996 competition act was put in. The RBOCS especially SBC are hurting and can't compete with all the regulations you have on them I keep watching the FCC web site and I am terribly upset with you fining them \$6 Million Dollars. Please help them and all the RBOCS. If you don't you might not even have a Company that can supply the lines. SBC is having to lay off another 11,000 employees and the other RBOCs will have too also. Thanks for listening to me and I hope you do something to help.